Application Serial No. 10/534,928   PATENT
Reply to office action of June 19, 2009   Docket: CU-4207

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending before this amendment. By the present amendment, claims 2 is <u>canceled</u> without prejudice; claims 1 and 3-21 are <u>amended</u>; and no new claims are <u>added</u>. No new matter has been added.

In the office action (page 2), claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The applicants have subsequently amended claim 13 by removing the basis for this rejection. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

In the office action (page 2), claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite.

The applicants have subsequently amended claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 19 and 21 by removing the basis for this rejection. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

In the office action (page 3), claims 1, 14 and 16 stand objected to as containing informalities.

The applicants have subsequently amended claims 1, 14 and 16 by removing the basis for this objection. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

In the office action (page 3), the abstract of the disclosure stands objected to as using the term "means".

The applicants have subsequently amended the abstract by removing the basis for this objection. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Application Serial No. 10/534,928   PATENT
Reply to office action of June 19, 2009   Docket: CU-4207

      In the office action (page 4), claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.
§102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,272,631 (Thomlinson).

      The applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the claims, as they now
stand, are in condition for allowance.

      The applicants respectfully submit that Thomlinson fails to disclose that at least
one of the logic memory spaces can be used for storing an algorithm, the controller
module can execute a designated algorithm according to input data from the universal
interface and transmit a result of the execution via the universal interface as recited in
the claims.

      In contrast to Thomlinson, independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to a
method for realizing data security storage and algorithm storage by means of a
semiconductor memory device, which recites that "at least one of the logic memory
spaces is used for storing an algorithm, the controller module executes a designated
algorithm according to input data from the universal interface and transmits a result of
the execution via the universal interface". In addition, the amended independent claim
14 is directed to a method for realizing algorithm storage by means of a semiconductor
memory device, which recites "using at least one of the logic memory spaces for storing
an algorithm" and "the controller module executing a designated algorithm according to
the input data, and transmitting a result of the execution via the universal interface".

      According to the technical solution of the amended claims 1 and 14, at least one
of the logic memory spaces of the semiconductor storage medium module can be used
for storing an algorithm and data to be protected.

      However, Thomlinson does not even hint at an algorithm that can be stored by
the storage server since the data stored by the storage server comprises "the encrypted
individual data item, the item authentication code, the encrypted item key, the encrypted
item authentication key, the key authentication code, the encrypted master key, and the
encrypted master authentication key" (lines 39-45 of column 10).

      Furthermore, in the amended claims 1 and 14, a designated algorithm can be

Page 12 of 13

Application Serial No. 10/534,928
Reply to office action of June 19, 2009

PATENT
Docket: CU-4207

executed by the controller module, and an execution result can be transmitted by the controller module. In other words, a designated algorithm will be loaded in the controller module and executed in the controller module, which is discussed in detail in lines 10-20 of page 14 of the original filed specification. However, according to Thomlinson, the data stored by the storage server will be retrieved when requested rather than being executed as codes. Accordingly, Thomlinson fails to disclose that the controller module executes the designated algorithm and transmits the result of the execution.

In light of the above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 14 are not anticipated by Thomlinson. As such, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-13 and claims 15-21 are also not anticipated by Thomlinson for at least the reason that they depend from claim 1 and claim 14, respectively.

For the reasons set forth above, the applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, and 3-21, now pending in this application, are in condition for allowance over the cited references. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and earnestly solicit an indication of allowable subject matter.

This amendment is considered to be responsive to all points raised in the office action. Should the examiner have any remaining questions or concerns, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to expeditiously resolve such concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: **December 18, 2009**

Loren K. Thompson, Ph.D., Reg. No. 45,918
Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300

Page 13 of 13